



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

in God, and sought to find in every religion a moment in the development of the *idea* of religion, but in a purely logical way.

The error common to both speculative and rationalistic thought was the assumption that Christianity is essentially doctrine, revelation a communication or acquisition of knowledges, and its content objective theoretical *Weltanschauung* rather than subjective spiritual life-determination. This error was overcome *practically* by the Reformers and *theoretically* by Schleiermacher. With him religion has an independent basis as a distinct inner quality of the human spirit—namely, feeling (*Gemüth, Gefühl*), and it is, therefore, not interchangeable with doctrine or morality. The essence of Christianity is not to be found in a faith in facts of history, nor in a principle of reason dialectically disclosed, but in *the absolutely archetypal person of Jesus Christ*—not his empirical appearing, but *the peculiar determinateness of his God-consciousness*. This is the eternal infinite principle of Christianity, which exists perfectly in Christ, but did not come to perfect manifestation in his empirical life.

A very concise, clear summary, written from the Ritschlian point of view.

GEORGE CROSS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE WAHRE BEDEUTUNG DER GLAUBENSRECHTFERTIGUNG. VON DR. ZITZLAFF, Superintendent in Fehrbellin; *Studien und Kritiken*, 1897, pp. 489–577.

THE Catholic church holds that in connection with justification there is a change in the believer's character; and that this change is effected by the believer himself, under the influence of divine grace. Justification and sanctification are simultaneous and identical, and both alike depend upon human coöperation.

The Evangelical Lutheran church holds that justification is an act of pure grace on God's part, for the sake of the righteousness of Christ, and without the coöperation of men.

In their zeal to guard against the error of the Catholics in making faith meritorious, some of the theologians of the church, following the Formula of Concord, were led to declare that justification is a forensic act, a declaration of pardon merely, a matter of God's judgment simply, not affecting in any way the believer's character. *Quæ actio, cum sit extra hominem non potest hominem intrinsece mutare* (Hollaz).

This position is untenable, is contrary to the idea of faith, and to the doctrines of the reformers and of the Scriptures.

1. It is untenable. It cannot be defended against the objection that the righteousness imputed would then only be putative, not real righteousness, and that it implies that God pronounces a man righteous when he is really unrighteous.

2. It is contrary to the idea of faith. *Fides*, according to the symbols of the Evangelical church, is not simply *notitia*, or *notitia* with *assensus*, but before all *fiducia*. Luther calls it the living trust upon the grace of God. Melancthon says of it: *Quia fides affert spiritum sanctum et parit novam vitam in cordibus, necesse est, quod pariat spirituales in cordibus* (*Apol. Confess.*, III, 4). Faith is never thought of except as involving a change in man, a renewal of one's innermost being.

3. The forensic theory is contrary to the doctrines of the reformers. (a) It is contrary to the views of Luther. In his sermon "The Freedom of the Christian" he speaks of faith as making righteous, as completely changing a man within, uniting him to Christ as bride to bridegroom. With Luther "justification and sanctification were not two separate experiences, but two events united in one." See his *Sermon on Good Works*, *The Larger Catechism*, and *The Smalcald Articles*. (b) It is contrary to the views of Melancthon. According to him justification is equivalent to a sinner's pardon and acceptance with God. Faith and sanctification are joined together in indissoluble unity. As Eichhorn says of him, "that God could look at a thing different from what it is never came into his mind." (c) The views of the reformers, as gathered from Luther's *Larger Catechism*, *The Augsburg Confession*, *The Apology*, and *The Articles of Smalcald*, may thus be summarized: God in the gospel offers grace and mercy. He who believes the gospel is just with God. This belief involves the acknowledgment of being sinful, of being subject to wrath, and of deserving God's judgments; it involves the belief that Jesus made an atonement for sin, that he fulfilled the law, freed men from its curse, and so reconciled God. (d) But he who thus believes cannot be an unconverted man. He has already become a new man, converted, turned his face, not his back, towards God. His heart has an entirely new direction. That faith is not the condition of the new life, but is itself the new life, seems to me to be beyond doubt. It is not the condition of our acceptance, it is our acceptance; not the means to the cure, but the cure. And justification is only declaring what is. God declares a man

δίκαιος, when he is δίκαιος, not righteous in a juridical sense, that is, absolutely correct, but in the sense of being acceptable to him.

4. The forensic theory is contrary to the Scriptures; in particular to the epistle to the Romans. The theme of this epistle is the righteousness of God, brought to light in the gospel as a power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth. δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ (1:17) means the righteousness of God's being. The disclosure of this is the main and weightiest part of this epistle, and is ever kept in the foreground. This righteousness was revealed in part in God's wrath against sin. It is now disclosed in all its fullness in Christ. It is inclusive of grace and mercy. While still condemning sin, God can now pardon and save the sinner and still be righteous. To believe this is to acknowledge God's righteousness, and God cannot but declare those who believe to be righteous, since they answer to all that the disclosure of his righteousness designed. εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον (3:26). Every believer in this righteousness experiences it as a power unto salvation. This is most clearly brought out in chap. 8. "The law of the spirit of life hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (8:2). This law of the spirit is the spirit of God, which lives in every believer and gives his life a new direction and power. What the law could not do the revelation of the righteousness of God could. It brings with it a spirit which every believer receives, a spirit which is the beginning of a new life.

This being so, δικαιοῦν cannot signify a mere forensic act. There must be of necessity a change of being on the part of the δικαιωθείς. This is exactly what appears in believers. Through this change they become indeed δίκαιοι, and are not merely declared so juridically.

The question whether δικαιοῦν means to make righteous or to pronounce righteous does not affect my position. Neither does the expression λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην (4:3, 5, 9). For the faith reckoned for righteousness *is* righteousness for God.

The various legal expressions of the epistle are easily accounted for on the ground that it was written against the adherents of the Jewish legal righteousness.

Even according to the common conception of the epistle, the position that δικαιοῦν is simply declarative is untenable. It is incompatible with the strong emphasis which the epistle throughout lays on faith (1:16, 17; 3:22, 25, 26, 28; 4:3, 5, 17-22, 25; 5:1, etc.). Justification is too closely united to faith to make it such an external affair as

the forensic theory requires. Various particular passages against the forensic theory are: 5:17, where the justified are said to receive the gift of righteousness; 5:19, which says that by the gift of one many shall be constituted *κατασταθήσονται* — righteous; 6:2-13, where the believer's life is compared to a dying and rising with Christ, and as being alive unto God through Jesus Christ. See also 6:15, 16; 7:1 *seq.*, and 8:5; 14:15.

This is an able article. That the author succeeds in showing that the forensic theory, as he defines it, is untenable and contrary to the teachings of Melancthon, Luther, and Paul admits, it seems to us, of no doubt whatever. But it should be observed that he deals with the most extreme type of that theory.

The author's own view is very attractive, and is, we are inclined to believe, not far removed from that of the apostle Paul. Two things, however, must be said about it: (a) His conception of justification is truer than his definition of faith. He emphasizes too much the intellectual side of faith, the relation of man to the gospel, and does not lay sufficient stress on its volitional side, the attitude of the soul toward Christ and God. (b) It is to be observed that in the writer's own view justification is still forensic, not efficient; declaratory, not causative. And this it must be, if we are to retain the New Testament view. The correction for the view which the author is opposing is not in denying that justification is a forensic act, but in denying that its declaration is contrary to fact. The author would have done better to have recognized this, and not to have defined forensic in so narrow and exclusive a manner.

Some of the incidental positions of the author are also open to criticism. He asserts that those who make faith a condition of justification make it a merit. But is this so? It is no merit in me that I breathe God's free air in order to live, though it is the indispensable condition of my maintaining physical life. The subject of the epistle to the Romans is not, as he asserts, the righteousness of God brought to light as a power unto salvation, but righteousness attained through faith. Nor is the righteousness of God the power unto salvation; the gospel is that power. His definition of the divine righteousness is not exact, either. God's righteousness, as Paul uses the term, does not include his grace and mercy. Grace and mercy are attributes of God's being, coördinate with righteousness.

G. D. HEUVER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.